NEWS ANALYSIS NO. 1-1711 OCTOBER 27, 1976
RONALD J. DUNLAVEY

TRANSKEI'S CONTROVERSIAL INDEPENDENCE

ANNCR: THERE'S A NEW NATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA---BUT NO ONE SEEMS VERY HAPPY ABOUT IT. VOA NEWS ANALYST RONALD J. DUNLAVEY DISCUSSES THE EMRGENCE OF THE CONTROVERSIAL STATE KNOWN AS TRANSKEI:

VOICE: TUESDAY MARKED THE BEGINNING OF WHAT HAS COME TO BE AN INSTITUTION AT THE UNITED NATIONS---THE ANNUAL DEBATE ON APARTHEID, OR LEGALIZED RACIAL SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA. THIS IS THE FIRST YEAR THE DEBATE HAS TAKEN PLACE IN THE FULL GENERAL ASSEMBLY RATHER THAN IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE. AND THE ASSEMBLY STARTED THE DEBATE OFF BY CONDEMNING AS A SHAM THE CREATION OF THE NEW STATE OF TRANSKEI, IN SOUTHERN AFRICA. (OPT) THE TRANSKEI IS A SMALL TERRITORY LOCATED ON THE INDIAN OCEAN AT THE SOUTHEASTERN TIP OF AFRICA. IT IS ONE OF THE TRIBAL ENCLAVES WHICH HAVE LONG PROVIDED CHEAP LABOR FOR SOUTH AFRICA'S MINES AND INDUSTRY.(END OPT)

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S ACTION CAME AS NO SURPRISE. THE STATE OF TRANSKEI, AS ESTABLISHED--- A "SO-CALLED" STATE, AS IT WAS DESCRIBED AT THE U.N. --- HAD BEEN REJECTED IN ADVANCE BY JUST ABOUT EVERYBODY. TRANSKEI IS ONE OF SEVERAL BANTUSTANS, OR "HOMELANDS" WHICH THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT IS IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGING INTO SUPPOSEDLY INDEPENDENT STATES. BUT MOST OBSERVERS SEE THE PROCESS AS ONE DESIGNED TO PERPETUATE THE POLICY OF APARTHEID BY DEPRIVING THE BLACK PEOPLE IN SOUTH AFRICA OF CITIZENSHIP IN THAT COUNTRY WHILE CONTINUING TO EXPLOIT THEM ECONOMICALLY. INTERNATIONAL DISAPPROVAL WAS SO GREAT THAT WHEN TRANSKEI INDEPENDENCE WAS PROCLAIMED TUESDAY THE ONLY FOREIGN OFFICIALS PRESENT WERE THE PRESIDENT OF SOUTH AFRICA AND A URUGUYAN GENERAL.

(OPT) AND DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION IS UNLIKELY, ESPECIALLY IN VIEW OF THE U.N. VOTE, WHICH DECLARED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TRANSKEI---AND SIMILAR STATES---TO BE INVALID AND AN UNACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTE FOR THE RIGHTS WHICH BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS ARE SEEKING.(END OPT.)

OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-FIVE MEMBERS PRESENT, ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-FOUR VOTED FOR THE RESOLUTION, WITH THE UNITED STATES ABSTAINING. THIS ABSTENTION PUZZLED SOME OBSERVERS, FOR THE UNITED STATES HAS FOR YEARS STRONGLY CONDEMNED APARTHEID, AND ONLY LAST WEEK DECLARED THAT IT HAD NO INTENTION OF RECOGNIZING THE TRANSKEI. AS IT TURNED OUT, THE UNITED STATES WAS ONE OF SEVERAL U.N. MEMBERS WHO HAD RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE LOOSE WORDING OF THE RESOLUTION, AND WASHINGTON FELT THOSE RESERVATIONS WERE TROUBLESOME ENOUGH TO WARRANT AN ABSTENTION. FOR ONE THING, THE RESOLUTION, IN EFFECT, IMPOSED SANCTIONS BY CALLING ON ALL MEMBERS TO REFRAIN FROM ANY DEALINGS WITH TRANSKEI---AND SINCE ONLY THE SECURITY COUNCIL HAS THE POWER TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS, THIS COULD BE ONE MORE CASE OF A PRECEDENT WHICH WOULD WEAKEN THE CHARTER. FURTHERMORE, WASHINGTON FEELS THAT IT IS NOT A GOOD IDEA TO COMPLETELY CUT OFF CONTACTS WITH SOUTH AFRICANS, INCLUDING THOSE IN THE TRANSKEI, WHO ARE FIGHTING FOR RACIAL JUSTICE AND SOCIAL EQUALITY.

NEVERTHELESS, THE UNITED STATES MADE IT CLEAR THAT IT DOES NOT INTEND TO HAVE ANY DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS WITH TRANSKEI. NOR DOES IT APPEAR LIKELY THAT VERY MANY OTHERS ARE LIKELY TO DO SO. TRANSKEI MAY BE THE WORLD'S NEWEST STATE, BUT IT ALSO COULD VERY WELL TURN OUT TO BE THE LONELIEST. THE QUESTION NOW IS WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA, IN THE FACE OF THIS

ALMOST UNANIMOUS INTERNATIONAL DISAPPROVAL, WILL PERSIST IN A POLICY WHICH IS WIDELY CONSIDERED TO BE UNJUST, UNWISE AND --- IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS--- UNWORKABLE.

-0-